128.65
C3M87
885
.1

LIBRARY
OF THE
AMERICAN MUSEUM
OF NATURAL HISTORY

507 (74.71)

THE ◁MUSEUMS▷ IN THE PARK.

SHOULD THEY BE OPENED ON SUNDAY?

PRESS OF
RUFUS ADAMS,
No. 167 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.
1885.

December 12th, 1885.

To M. K. Jesup, Esq.,
President, Etc.

Dear Sir :

In view of the agitation of the question of opening the Museums in the Park on Sunday, we respectfully ask that you allow the argument on the subject recently made by yourself, before the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, to be printed for the information of the undersigned and the public generally.

Your fellow Citizens,

JOHN ELLIOT.	D. WILLIS JAMES
C. R. AGNEW.	HENRY C. POTTER.
JAS. M. BROWN.	HOWARD CROSBY.
JNO. E. PARSONS.	JOHN A. STUART.
WM. M. TAYLOR.	GUSTAV SCHWAB.
JOHN HALL.	HENRY A. OAKLEY.
HOWARD POTTER.	WM. H. ARNOUX.

Sunday Opening of the Museums in the Park.

At a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, held at the office of the Mayor, October 30th, 1885, Mr. Morris K. Jesup, and other members of the Executive Committee of the American Museum of Natural History were present, in compliance with the following request :

Board of Estimate and Apportionment,
New York, Oct. 27th, 1885.

Mr. M. K. Jessup.

Dear Sir :

At a meeting of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment held this day, it was

Resolved—That the President of the American Museum of Natural History be invited to attend the meeting of the said Board, to be held on Friday. October 30th, at 3 o'clock, P. M., at the Mayor's office, when an opportunity will be afforded him to be heard relative to an appropriation for the said Museum.

The Board desire some information relative thereto.

Very respectfully,
CHARLES V. ADEE, Clerk.

In behalf of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, under a similar invitation, there were present Mr. Daniel Huntington, Vice-President, and other trustees, who asked Mr. Jesup, in the absence of their President, to present the case for both Museums, as the two Museums were alike in their objects and in their relation to the City.

Mr. Jesup inquired of the Mayor if the only question to be discussed in the matter of the appropriation for the Museums, was that of the opening of the Museums on Sunday. The Mayor answered that it was.

Mr. Jesup then spoke substantially as follows :

Mr. Chairman :

The question before us is one of much importance, and deserves candid consideration. In May last the Board of Aldermen, and in April the Board of Park Commissioners, passed resolutions asking

the trustees of the two Museums to open them on Sunday. It was not a new question to the trustees of the Museum of Natural History. They have had the matter before them for two years past.

It is fair to believe that the Board of Aldermen and the Park Commissioners are honest in their conviction as to what the Museums ought to do in the matter. On the other hand, it is fair to believe that the trustees of the Museums have just as much regard for the public good as these Boards.

Look over the list of the trustees and supporters of these Museums up to the present time, and I think you will allow that they have a right to claim that they have as much at heart the interests of the people of New York,—their education, elevation, moral and temporal welfare, as any other citizens.

There are two sides to the question before us. There are serious difficulties in the way of opening the Museums on Sunday, which should be fairly looked at.

1. Good faith in carrying out the contract between the City and the Museums, under which the Museums are conducted, seems to forbid their being opened on Sunday.

As you are aware, the two Museums, that of Natural History, which I represent, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, existed as private institutions before their present relations to the city. They were each in possession of large and very valuable collections. It was desired that these should be made still more useful to our citizens generally. Accordingly, by authority of the Legislature, a contract was entered into between each of the Museums and the Board of Park Commissioners, by which contract the city agreed to put a suitable building at the disposal of each Museum, and to keep the same in repair, and each Museum agreed to open its collection to the public, *under certain specified conditions.*

Let me quote the terms of the Contract with the Museum of Natural History :

This Agreement, made and concluded on the twenty-second day of December, in the year one-thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, between the Department of Public Parks of the City of New York, the party of the first part, and the American Museum of Natural History, party of the second part, witnesseth :

Whereas, By an Act of the Legislature of the State of New York, passed April 22d, 1876, entitled "An Act in relation to the powers and duties of the Board of Commissioners of the De-

partment of Public Parks, in connection with the American Museum of Natural History, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art," the said party of the first part is authorized to enter into a contract with the said party of the second part, for the occupation by it of the buildings erected or to be erected on that portion of the Central Park, in the City of New York, known as Manhattan Square, and for transferring thereto, and establishing and maintaining therein its Museum, library and collections, and carrying out the objects and purposes of said party of the second part, &c., &c.

And Whereas, It is desired as well by the said party of the first part, as by the said party of the second part, that immediately upon the completion and equipment of said building, the said party of the second part should be established therein, and should transfer thereto its Museum, Library and Collections, and carry out the objects and purposes of the said party of the second part.

Now, Therefore, it is agreed by and between the said parties, as follows, namely :

"First. That the said party of the first part has granted, and demised, and let, and doth by these presents, grant, demise and let, unto the said party of the second part, the said building and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, to have and to hold the same so long as the said party of the second part shall continue to carry out the objects and purposes defined in its charter, or such other objects and purposes as by any future amendment of said charter may be authorized ; and shall faithfully keep, perform and observe the covenants and conditions herein contained on its part to be kept, performed and observed, or until the said building shall be surrendered by the said party of the second part, as hereinafter provided."

It is then provided that *the party of the first part will keep said building from time to time, in repair.* Then follows the conditions, viz. :

"Fourthly. That the exhibition halls of said building shall, *on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday of each week, and on all legal or public holidays, except Sundays*, be kept open and accessible to the public, free of charge, from nine o'clock A.M., until half an hour before sunset, under such rules and regulations as the party of the second part shall, from time to time, prescribe; but on the remaining days of the week the same shall

be open only for exhibition to such persons, upon such terms as the said party of the second part shall from time to time direct. But all professors and teachers of public schools of the City of New York, or other institutions of learning in said city, in which instruction is given free of charge, shall be admitted to all advantages afforded by said party of the second part, through its Museum, Library, apparatus and collections, or otherwise, for study, research and investigation, free of any charge therefor, and to the same extent and on the same terms and conditions as any other persons as are admitted to such advantages as aforesaid."

Now, *on the basis of this contract*, the city has put at the disposal of the trustees, the museum building, with an agreement to keep the same in repair. On the other hand, the trustees and those whom they represent, have placed within this building such collections, in the various departments of natural history, as it would be almost impossible to fix a money value upon. These gifts, it may be implied, have been made on that contract. The contract excepted Sunday from the days on which the Museum was required to be open. This was in accordance with the convictions and habits of our people. The fair understanding of the contract, on the part of those who entered into it, was undoubtedly that the Museum was not to be opened on Sunday. For the trustees to violate that contract, fairly construed, would seem to be a breach of trust which I am sure you, gentlemen, would think ought not to be made.

If the Park Board and the Board of Aldermen have a right to ask that the Museums be opened on Sunday, they have just as good a right to ask that other parts of the contract be disregarded.

2. Now, as to the subsequent support of the Museums. Contrary to what has been often and publicly stated, the figures show that the city has contributed less than one-third to the support of the Museum of Natural History, and a portion of this one-third has been used in *keeping the building in repair*.

The Museum costs, for maintenance, care, &c., an average of over $25,000 a year. The trustees have endeavored in every possible way, to bring its necessities and wants before the public. And yet, the trustees have themselves had to contribute to supplement its annual expenses, more than $6,000 a year.

[The Mayor asked if Mr. Jesup meant to say that, out of $25,000 annually expended, to which the city contributed $15,000, the sub-

scriptions of members had been $4,000, and the trustees had given the rest? $6,000. Mr. Jesup said, "Yes."]

The following is a summary of the cash receipts of the Museum of Natural History down to January 1st, 1885.

From Trustees, Patrons, Fellows, Members,	$316,424.71
" the City	110,722.99
" the State Supt. of P. I.	2,160.50
" Interest	1,169.98
" the Sale of Guides	360.00
	$430,838.18

From this it appears that, of the total amount, the city has given scarcely more than one quarter, and of this sum, a part has been expended in repairs on the building.

I have been looking over the names of those who have given this large sum of money, exclusive of the city. I have no right to speak of them, or of their religious belief, but from what I know of their views, I am persuaded that the very large majority of these subscriptions have come from those who desire to see the Lord's day observed and protected.

One of the objections to Sunday opening is the very considerable expense that it would entail on the Museum. On this point it is fair to state, that, in my judgment, a large portion of the money now contributed by our constituency would be withheld if the Museum is opened on Sunday. As President of the Museum, therefore, and knowing its business arrangements, supposing other objections removed, I would not consider it safe, in a financial point of view, for the trustees to open the Museum on Sunday, unless we had at least $10,000 pledged, besides the $15,000 now contributed by the city. Is the city prepared to give this additional contribution?

It should also be stated that the collections in each Museum are of such a nature and value, that the care of them cannot be entrusted to inexperienced men. If the Museums were open on Sunday, a force of men tried and trained for the work, would have to be employed permanently, at a greatly increased expense.

3. Aside from the foregoing considerations, I maintain that it is not for the interest of the people, especially of the workingmen, to open the Museums on Sunday. My position is taken both from what I know of the workingmen themselves, and of the value to them of Sunday as a day of rest from toil and labor, of the many

influences that tend to rob them of it, as well as from what has taken place in the countries of Europe.

It is the popular reverence for the day as a non-secular day, which is its main defence as a rest day. Break down this popular reverence for the day as a holy day—destroy this distinction between it and the week days, and it will inevitably become a working day. This is especially true in a country like ours, where competition is so severe and exacting.

Open the Museums on Sunday and I fear you cannot stop there. Other so-called "instructive recreations and entertainments" will follow.

If it is right to open Museums on Sunday for the study of works of art, the question may be asked, why is it not right to study art at operas and theatres also on Sunday? If persons who find recreation and amusement at museums and art-galleries may have such public entertainments opened for their benefit on Sunday, why should the classes who have no taste for museums or art-galleries, but who do enjoy theatres and operas, and minstrels and circuses, not be allowed to have such places open on Sunday?

This is the very ground taken by not a few who are pressing this measure. This is what they call a Free Sunday, this is the Sunday of Paris, and this is what they aim to have here.

By this means the distinction between the secular and non-secular days of the week is broken down, and a breach is made in the workingman's defence of the day as his rest-day.

The next step would be, as is the case in France, the overthrow of all laws which protect the workingman's right to rest on Sunday.

I cannot help quoting here a sentence or two from the London *Times*, June 9, 1877, on this very point.

"The Streets of London on a Sunday are a strong contrast to those of a great Continental town, and bespeak a population who are tasting a day's respite from business of all kinds. The closing of our National Museums and Galleries we believe to be eminently conducive to the health, the good order and the mental and moral balance of our population. To open these institutions on a Sunday by a formal Parliamentary vote, must of necessity have an extensive reflex effect. Where is the line to be drawn between public and private exhibitions, between galleries and theatres, for instance? In point of fact, in the parallel cases abroad, the line is not drawn; and we may be quite sure that if drawn in this country it would not be maintained. We should make a complete breach in the defences which now protect the Sunday as a day of rest, and should have definitely abandoned our general rule. Once throw open by a resolution of the House of Commons all national museums

and picture galleries on Sundays, and it is hard to see what institutions, public or private, we could insist on closing."

It is urged that workingmen have no time but Sunday in which to visit the Museums. But is this true? Beside the six or eight holidays of the year, occasional off-days occur in every trade.

There is, moreover, the Saturday half-holiday, with the movement to secure which I am in the fullest sympathy. I believe that what our workingmen want is, more time for rest and intelligent recreation during the week. If merchants and manufacturers and business men of this city could be induced to give their employes a Saturday half-holiday, this would give time for laboring men to visit the Museums without opening on Sunday. I wish that this experiment might be given a fair trial. *Open the Museums on Sunday, and you will weaken the motive for extending the Saturday half-holiday, and otherwise shortening the hours of labor.*

Further, the Trustees of the Museum, in hearty sympathy with you in the desire to make the Museum as useful as possible to all classes, have for some time past had under consideration the lighting the Museum by electricity, so that it may be opened for certain evenings in the week. And with this in view, we have also been in consultation with the Elevated Railroad, to see if reduced fares may not be secured for visitors to the Museum. Our desire is to make the valuable collections under our care as useful as possible to the largest number.

Personally, I am in favor of opening the Museum on, say, two evenings a week, and should be glad, were the means put at our disposal, to provide competent lecturers to explain its treasures to workingmen and others who might be interested in studying them.

The practicability of opening museums for working people on week evenings has been shown in England.

The South Kensington Museum, from 1857, has been opened six days in the week, in the day time, and three evenings a week, with an attendance for the six days of 15,300,000, and for the three evenings 6,500,000. The Bethnal Green Museum, in a workingmen's neighborhood, has been open since 1872, in the day-time, for six days in a week, and in the evening, three days in the week, with an attendance of 3,019,000 for the evening, and 3,176,000 for the day-time. The evidence shows that a considerable proportion of the visitors were working people.

4. In the discussion of this question in the papers, reference-

has been made to England, and the agitation of this very question there. What are the facts in the case?

England is almost the only country in Europe where the laws and customs protect the right to rest on Sunday. The English workingman has his Sunday, and also the Saturday half-holiday; he works fifty-five hours a week, against the French artisan's seventy-two hours. With good reason does the English workingman jealously guard his Sunday rest.

For twenty years past efforts have been repeatedly made in Parliament to open the British Museum and National Art Galleries on Sunday, in the pretended interest of the workingman, but these efforts have always been defeated. Among those who have voted and spoken against the measure have been such as Beaconsfield, Gladstone, Lord Chancellors Cairns and Selborne, Shaftesbury, Sir Charles Reed, late Chairman of the London School Board, Thomas Hughes, founder of the Co-operative movement among workingmen, Mr. Mundella, the well-known advocate of arbitration, and Broadhurst, the Trade Unionist, and other advocates of the workingmen.

In the House of Lords the motion to open the Museums has been lost as often as made. During the present year, in the House of Lords, a motion to open merely the Natural History Museum, at South Kensington, was defeated by a tie vote.

But as the London *Times* (March 21st, 1885) says: "The mat-
" ter is not one on which the House of Lords has any special right
" to pronounce, or on which its opinion either way can count for
" much. It is a workingman's question, and we are inclined to
" think that the practical result of yesterday's division has
" been what the majority of workingmen would have wished it
" to be.

In the House of Commons, which better represents the popular sentiment, the last time the motion to open the British Museum and Public Galleries on Sunday came up was in 1882. It was defeated by a vote of 208 to 83, a majority of 125. Among those who voted against it on this occasion were Mr. Gladstone and his two sons, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Broadhurst and others.

Now what are the reasons which induced such men—men whom no one can accuse of narrow-mindedness; men, some of them known for their devotion to the rights and interests of the working classes—to oppose this motion. Let me quote some of their own words:

The late *Earl of Beaconsfield*, who voted on two occasions in the House of Lords against opening museums, etc., on Sundays, said, on May 5th, 1879 : "Of all Divine institutions, the most Divine is "that which secures a day of rest for man. I hold it to be the most "valuable blessing ever conceded to man. It is the corner stone of "civilization, and its removal might even affect the health of the "people. . . . . It (the opening of museums on Sundays) "is a great change, and those who suppose for a moment that it "could be limited to the proposal of the noble Baron to open "museums will find they are mistaken."

Mr. Gladstone, as Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, said, April 18th, 1871 : "From a long experience of a laborious "life, he had become most deeply impressed with the belief—to say "nothing of a higher feeling—that the alternations of rest and "labor, at the short intervals which were afforded by the merciful "and blessed institution of Sunday, was a necessity for the reten-"tion of man's mind and of a man's frame in a condition to dis-"charge his duties ; and it was desirable, as much as possible, to "restrain the exercise of labor upon the Sunday, and to secure to "the people the enjoyment of the day of rest."

Lord Shaftesbury, than whom few in England better understood or more fully sympathized with workingmen, in the debate in the House of Lords, February 23d, 1881, after urging that while the opening of museums would directly or indirectly increase Sunday work, and would not draw any from the saloons, for men who went there did not care to stroll through picture galleries or natural history museums, emphasized another point when he said :

"Sunday is a day so sacred, so important, so indispensable to man, that it ought to be hedged round by every form of reverence. . . . The working people of this country—the great bulk of the working people—regard it in that light. They differ, no doubt, many of them. Some take a religious view of the matter ; others take a more political view of it ; but all are of this mind, that the sanctity of Sunday is to them a grand protection, and you may hear it from their own lips repeatedly, if you consulted them, that it is their only protection from having to perform seven days' work for six days' wages. It is a great thing to encourage in these men, particularly in these days of uncertainty and of change, a belief that they can trust in any thing that is now established. There is a great change coming over our population. The feeling of reverence is declining very fast. The last spark of reverence with them is the reverence for the Lord's day. Extinguish that spark, my lords, and you will have a generation of men in mind and in action very different from those who preceded them."

To the same effect, said *Lord Cairns*, in the same debate :

"The institution of Sunday is only maintained because the vast majority of the people of this country, altogether irrespective of churches or denominations, are convinced that it depends not upon human law, but upon a higher and greater law which we are all bound in conscience to obey. If your Lordships, by your vote, leave the country to think that the institution of Sunday has no such sanction as those to which I allude, you will shock the consciences of a vast majority of the people of this country, and also lead, in my opinion, to the destruction of Sunday as a day of rest."

In the House of Commons, the last discussion of this motion was in May, 1882. Mr. Broadhurst, member for Stoke, the leading representative in Parliament of the Trades Unions, himself a Trades Unionist of twenty-four years' membership, opposed the motion, and proposed the following amendment : "That in the opinion of the House it is undesirable that Parliament should further promote the employment of Sunday labor by authorizing the opening of the National Museums and Galleries, which are now closed on that day, but that such Museums and Galleries should be open between the hours of six and ten P. M., on at least three evenings in each week." He said :

"I regret exceedingly to find myself compelled to vote against the motion now under debate. I have taken this action entirely and distinctly in the interest of labor, and on behalf of that cause, with which I have been identified nearly all my life; and I say most distinctly that it is in the interest of labor that we should keep the seventh day as free and as fully relieved from all associations of labor as it is possible for us to do. I oppose this resolution also on the ground—and there can be no doubt upon the point—that there is no sufficient demand in the country to warrant the House in adopting the resolution submitted to it; and if the object aimed at is to bring the people nearer to the museums, or the museums nearer to the people, it would be far better and more safely accomplished by the plan which I have suggested in my amendment than it could possibly be by the motion of my honorable friend. Then again, if the resolution has any effect, it will only loosen the ties which now bind us together in defence of an absolute rest from labor on one day in seven. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the supposed demand in the country in favor of this motion, I find that there is not a single speaker on the opposite side who has for a moment attempted to contend that there is any considerable demand for this motion. Now, it is said that our working people have no opportunity of visiting those places unless we give them an opportunity of going on Sunday. (Dissent from an honorable member.) Well, my honorable friend, I fear, has not followed the change in the circumstances of the people as closely as I have. Consider what has been done during the last twenty-five years in favor of lessening our working hours on Saturday, and for starting at a later hour on Monday morning. If you peruse the arguments that have been used by the workingmen in conferences between the employers and the employed, upon the platform and in the press, in sup-

port of increased hours of leisure, I venture to say that you will find one of the reasons that we strongly urged was that we desired sufficient spare time in the week in order to take our fair share of secular enjoyment during the working days of the week, and to visit the museums and picture galleries which were closed on Sundays. (Cheers.) If you open those picture galleries and museums on Sunday, it must correspondingly weaken the argument in favor of our Saturday half-holiday.

"You talk of this motion relieving the public house of its customers on a Sunday. I will ask my honorable friend if he is prepared to say that the skilled artizans of this country—that the respectable work-people of this country—spend their Sundays in public-houses? I am certain he is not prepared to say so. Who are the poor, neglected creatures with whom our public-houses are filled on Sundays, if they are filled? They are those who are the most unfortunate of my class—the least skilled, and therefore the worst paid, and consequently the worst housed amongst our population. But surely you will not attempt to persuade this House to believe that this class of people, who loiter around the doors of a public-house during the hours that they cannot get admittance inside, are the people who are thirsting to worship your exhibitions of the fine arts miles from their homes. Will you suggest that these are the class of people who would rush in their teeming thousands to the British Museum to make scientific and historical examinations of the mummies and other curiosities that crowd the galleries, and to worship at the feet of the works of the old masters in the National Galleries? I am positive you will not advance such extraordinary arguments in its favor.

"Now, the argument of course is, that there is no fear of the general system of labor following a motion of this kind. Yes, but where are you going to draw the line? (Hear, hear.) Once you have admitted this abstract principle, how are you going to hold it fast, and not let it encroach by degrees? Do we not hear every day how English manufactures are suffering from the keen competition of France, Germany, and other countries, and that the nations which work seven days a week, or, at any rate, which observe in no regular form the cessation of labor on the seventh, have the advantage over English manufacturers, whose work-people work only on six days? If you admit this principle, that after all there is not so much in the general cessation of labor on the seventh day, when it suits the fancies of a minority to say so, how will you meet the demand if some fine morning it is thought to be discovered that in order to maintain our trade and great profits we must increase the hours of labor, and finally make an inroad on the Sunday's rest? I will not for a moment admit that any practical good can possibly come from the motion, and I sincerely hope that we shall never pass it."

In the same discussion, Mr. Mundella, M. P., a member of the Government, and widely known for his interest in questions of labor, during the same debate, says :

"There are 154 *Museums in the United Kingdom*, a great part of them *belonging to the municipalities of our large towns*, and there are *only four* of them which are open on Sunday. The town of Nottingham had done more for art and shown a higher appreciation of art than any town in England: it had obtained for itself a special act that it might tax itself highly to support its

museum, one of the finest provincial museums in England. It had been the subject of some contention whether that museum should be opened on Sunday or not; and at the last election the question was decisively settled by the rejecti on of those candidates who voted for the opening on Sunday. He was not now saying whether it was right or wrong; he was only illustrating what was public opinion; but he held that as long as it was the national sentiment, they were bound to respect it. Further, that contest at Nottingham was not decided by the Sabbatarians, as they were called, but, as the town clerk informed him, by the working men of the town, who were apprehensive that if they once began the system of opening the museums on the Sunday, some other consequences would follow, and by slow degrees the complete day of rest, which they all enjoyed, and which nobody, perhaps, required more than the members of that House, would be trenched upon, if it was not quite taken away. Indeed, the working classes now enjoyed art more and more; and nothing had done more to promote that enjoyment than the Saturday half holiday which had been instituted in this country in order that they might do so. We were the only nation in Europe which had the Saturday half holiday, in addition to which there were the Bank holidays, which gave opportunities to those classes to visit the national museums, of which they largely availed themselves. It was not museums which the people desired to visit on Sundays, but the fields and the country. They needed open air, enjoyment and rest. * * Those who had recently seen the rooms of the Royal Academy open from six to midnight, and admired the pictures in a light as clear as day, could not but believe that the British Museum and the National Gallery might with great advantage and perfect safety be open at night. South Kensington Museum had been visited in the evening by more than seven millions of people. Sunday, as a day of rest, was one of the greatest blessings a nation ever enjoyed. He hoped it would long maintain that character. It could only do so by mutual concession, each class in turn giving up some even innocent practice for the common benefit. Bearing in mind all the facts of the case, he held that until the national sentiment was so far changed as to make Sunday a day of amusement and recreation, rather than of perfect rest, it would be the duty of the government not to open these national institutions."

The motion to open the museums on Sunday was defeated by a vote of 208 to 83, and Mr. Broadhurst's amendment in favor of opening them on certain week-evenings, was adopted.

The *London Times*' editorial on this decision, said :

"The fact remains that the cry for the opening of museums on Sundays does not come from the working classes. It is raised on their account,—it is raised by their professed friends, but it is not raised by themselves. It is a matter of no small difficulty to induce them to take any interest in the case put forward on their behalf. They are suspicious of the proffered boon, and are far more ready to lend their names to a petition against it than in support of it. They value Sunday as a day of rest, and they wish above all things to make quite sure that it shall continue to be this * * * His working days belong to his master; his day of leisure is his own. He has no mind to let it go on any pretence, however plausible. While he continues in this

mood, it is up-hill work for his self-constituted friends. Their strongest ground is cut away from them. Their *a priori* arguments as to the right use of a Sunday holiday lose all their force. The working man knows now that he has one day in the week to himself, and he declines to be roused to indignation at restrictions which he does not feel, and at the absence of privileges which are of far less importance to him than those which he actually enjoys." —*The Times, May* 20th, 1882.

Pending these discussions in Parliament, the question has been widely agitated outside of Parliament.

After the decisive vote in the House of Commons in 1882, an appeal was made by both sides to the trades unions and other workingmen's societies. The result was that 62 such societies, with 45,482 members, voted in favor of the opening ; on the other hand, 2,412 societies, with 501,705 members voted against the Sunday opening, and in favor of Broadhurst's amendment, in addition to which the officers of 38 societies, with 29,812 members, signed on the same side, in their individual capacity (because their rules forbade political and similar discussions), but expressing their belief that their members held the same views.

These figures were publicly confirmed by Earl Cairns in the House of Lords last March. Summing up the petitions addressed to the House of Commons during the last ten years, he said there were 3,886 petitions with 524,000 names against the Sunday opening, 1,587 petitions with 79,900 names in favor of it. (London *Times,* March 21st, 1885).

The last canvass of clergy (Church of England) in London gave six to one against the Sunday opening, while of a total of 744 clergymen and Nonconformist ministers who voted on a like occasion in 1884, there were only 80 who favored even a modified Sunday opening, while 664 opposed it —*English Churchman, March* 26*th,* 1885.

The most recent expression of the views of workingmen was made at the *Trades Union Congress,* at Southport, in September last. A resolution in favor of the Sunday opening of Museums was lost by a vote of 69 to 51.

The London *Times* of September 12th thus remarks about this :—

"It is impossible in the space at our command to deal adequately with the wide range of subjects on which the Congress has been busy during the last few days. There are parts of the election address which we have read with pleasure, especially the clause which tells the workingman that his highest duty is not disposed of by attending to his own wants. The Sunday opening of museums and picture galleries gave occasion yesterday to a long

and animated debate. The final decision of the Congress was adverse to the opening, on the ground mainly that it is undesirable to augment Sunday work. The matter is one on which the working classes have the best right to speak. It is for their convenience that the opening has been proposed, and, if they think that the balance of advantage is against it, there is no more to be said, and the verdict must be accepted by those who profess to speak for them."

Let me add a few facts from continental Europe bearing on the point before us :

On the Continent of Europe the great majority of workingmen have to labor the whole or a part of Sunday. There is no law to protect them in claiming their right to rest. But they are by no means quiet under this state of things. Numerous societies of workingmen and their friends have been formed for the purpose of recovering the right to rest one day in seven.

In Germany, in 1865, the Printers' Society of Berlin appealed to all labor societies and well-disposed employers to join them in agitating against the custom of Sunday work in industrial establishments.

The "Socialistic Labor Party," formed at Gotha in 1875, made it as one of its foremost demands that Sunday labor be prohibited by the State.

Petitions from workingmen and others have been repeatedly sent to the German Parliament for a law forbidding Sunday work in factories except in cases of necessity.

On the 25th of April last (1885) a grand mass meeting was held in Berlin to favor a law to close all industrial and trading establishments on Sunday, at which were present delegations from various trade societies and a committee of the Parliament. The matter has since been discussed in Parliament, and it is said that the Government proposes to make an exhaustive inquiry into the whole subject of Sunday labor.

In Austria a similar agitation for several years past has resulted in the recent passage of a law stopping work on Sunday, but a large number of trades and professions are excepted from its provisions.

In France the old law forbidding common labor on Sunday, which had long been a dead letter, was formally repealed in 1880.

In 1881 the more intelligent French Socialists organized the "Workingmen's Society," the first article of whose economical programme is legal "prohibition of more than six days of labor in a week," together with a shortening of the hours of a day's work.

Said Louis Blanc, the famous radical, in advocating a bill in the Chamber of Deputies to limit the work of women and children in factories to eleven hours a day, for six days of the week :

"The weekly rest has been consecrated by all religions and nowhere is it more strictly observed than among Protestant people, who are pre-eminently laboring peoples. Diminution of the hours of labor does not involve any diminution of production. In England a workingman produces as much in fifty-six hours as a French workman in seventy-two hours, because his forces are better husbanded."

The Paris correspondent of the New York *World*, May 15, 1870, says :

"The seventh day brings no respite to them here. On the contrary, it is the day when they work the hardest. On no other night are the theatres so crammed; on no other day are the butchers' stalls frequented by more customers than on Sunday. It is not a day of rest in Paris—it is a day of activity. . . . . I have heard some Americans applaud this manner of spending Sunday, as they ridiculed the old-fashioned American way of hallowing this day. They do not know the sequence of this feverish activity. There is no old stonemason, no old shoemaker, no old carpenter, no old painter, no old artisan, in Paris. Medical men say this premature decline is owing absolutely to a want of a day of rest once a week. Going to museums, poring over books, amusements of every sort, 'improving the mind,' are equally pernicious as hard work."

Col. Forney, of Philadelphia, writing to his paper from Paris, some twelve years ago, quoted from *Galignani* the "Stranger's Diary" for Sunday : Nineteen theatres, sixteen other places of amusement, two horse races, etc., added :

"This is Paris on Sunday. * * When the degradation of that day of rest is completed and it is dishonored in America as it is here, freedom will have gone from us forever."

To sum up what I have said :—

The Museum has been established and carried on on the basis of a contract which, as understood by those who made it, excludes the Sunday opening. Good faith must be kept with those who have contributed so largely to its collections and maintenance, with this understanding.

The Museum has been established not for the benefit of any one class, but for all classes of the million and a quarter of this city. It should be carried on in accordance with the convictions and customs of our people. Among the most valued of the institutions of our people is the Sunday rest. So many influences now assail this that it should be jealously guarded, especially in the interests of the working classes.

The main defence of the Sunday rest is the popular reverence for the day. Break down this defence and the law will become as ineffectual here, as it is in Europe, to protect the workingman's right to rest. Open the museums and you cannot stop there. Theatres and other entertainments will follow.

And all this to accomplish an end which can better be accomplished in another way.

The view of the matter here presented is moreover amply sustained by the experience of England, where, as I have shown, all the National Galleries are closed on Sunday, and this in accordance with the views of the vast majority of the workingmen themselves.

I have not argued the opening or closing the museums on religious grounds. I do not hesitate to say that my personal convictions on this matter are very decided. But my personal views and, I am sure, those of the trustees, will not stand against demands made by the thoughtful people of the city, nor in the way of what shall be generally regarded as a great public good.

I have given you the reasons for the present attitude of the trustees in this matter. I trust that the Board will not place us in the unfortunate position of closing our Museum on the 1st of January, as we shall be obliged to do if the appropriation is withheld.

I may add that in looking over the law under which the appropriation is made, I believe that it is mandatory on this Board to grant this appropriation.

[At the conclusion of Mr. Jesup's remarks, Mr. D. Huntington, Vice President of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, said that he desired that the statements made by Mr. Jesup for the Museum of Natural History, be considered as made also for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. He said further, that the strong convictions on this subject of a very large class of our most valuable citizens and tax-payers, should not be disregarded.]